



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,978	02/17/2004	Peter M. Bonutti	782-A03-024	9101
33771	7590	02/03/2009	EXAMINER	
PAUL D. BIANCO			MASHACK, MARK F	
Fleit Gibbons Gutman Bongini & Bianco PL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
21355 EAST DIXIE HIGHWAY				3773
SUITE 115				
MIAMI, FL 33180				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/03/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/779,978	BONUTTI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARK MASHACK	3773	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5,7,8,10,14-20,22-25,35-39,42-46,48 and 52-58 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5,7,8,10,14-20,22-25,35-39,42-46,48 and 52-58 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to a communication dated 10/20/2008. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10, 14-20, 22-25, 35-39, 42-46, 48, 52-58 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. **Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10, 14-20, 22-25, 35-39, 42-43, 44-46, 48** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Winston et al. (3,513,848)** in view of **Yoon (US 5,908,429)**.

Winston et al. discloses a device as shown in fig. 3A having two compression elements 57A and 46A. One is held rigidly to tube 70a and the other is slidably movable

inside the outer tube. A spring 82a can bias the horn 57a either towards or away from anvil 46q. A source of ultrasonic power 71a is attached to the device.

Winston et al. discloses the invention as claimed with the exception of the specific compressive force. As Winston discloses that this force varies depending on the suture used, the prior art force applied by the spring being within the claimed range would have been expected to perform the intended function of the tightening of the suture as it would be sufficient to grip the suture and hold it steady during melting.

Winston also fails to provide the insulating sleeve.

Yoon teaches of a surgical device comprising an instrument designed to transmit various forms of energy *controllably* positioned into an insulated sleeve **12** (Column 8, Lines 51-59). Additionally, **Yoon** teaches of a collar **22** that is capable of receiving an end portion of a suture by frictional engagement. Furthermore, **Yoon** teaches of the instrument being frictionally biased into a first position (Column 11, Lines 53-59).

All of the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Given the teachings of **Yoon**, it would have been obvious to have provided **Winston** with such a sleeve, in order to protect the user and the patient from possible burns, while providing a sleeve through which the device could be inserted in order to suture internally.

4. **Claims 52-58** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Winston** in view of **Yoon** as applied to **claims 1, 24-25, 35, 43-44, 48** as above, and further in view of **Bates et al. (“Bates” US 6,348,056)**.

Winston in view of **Yoon** disclose all of the claimed limitations except for the proximal end of the elongated insulation sleeve including a channel for engaging a pin positioned on the second member, and wherein the channel and the pin cooperate to control a range of motion of the sleeve over the second member. However, **Bates** teaches that it is commonly known in the art at the time of the invention to controllable move an instrument within a sleeve **12** by providing a pin **18** on the instrument and a groove **14** on the sleeve (FIG 11). All of the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Given the teachings of **Bates**, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of **Winston** as modified by **Yoon** with a pin and groove. Doing so would provide an easy way to provide relative motion between the sheath and instrument.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The amendment further narrowed the

scope of the independent claims by amending the term "slidably" to "controllably" in addition to the new dependant claims containing structure clarifying the term "controllably". Applicant acknowledged that the previous rejection was proper by making this amendment.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARK MASHACK whose telephone number is (571)270-3861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jackie Ho can be reached on (571) 272-4696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark Mashack/
Examiner, Art Unit 3773

/(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3773